



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/681,580	10/06/2003	Glenn H. MacKal	380804.00116	6851

7590

10/12/2005

Stefan V. Stein
Holland & Knight LLP
Suite 4100
100 N. Tampa Street
Tampa, FL 33602-3644

EXAMINER

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 10/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SP

Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief (37 CFR 41.37)	Application No. 10/681,580	Applicant(s) MACKAL ET AL.	
	Examiner Eric Keasel	Art Unit 3754	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

The Appeal Brief filed on 15 August 2005 is defective for failure to comply with one or more provisions of 37 CFR 41.37.

To avoid dismissal of the appeal, applicant must file an amended brief or other appropriate correction (see MPEP 1205.03) within **ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS** from the mailing date of this Notification, whichever is longer.
EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136.

1. ☒ The brief does not contain the items required under 37 CFR 41.37(c), or the items are not under the proper heading or in the proper order.
2. ☐ The brief does not contain a statement of the status of all claims, (e.g., rejected, allowed, withdrawn, objected to, canceled), or does not identify the appealed claims (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(iii)).
3. ☐ At least one amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection, and the brief does not contain a statement of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(iv)).
4. ☒ (a) The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawings, if any, by reference characters; and/or (b) the brief fails to: (1) identify, for each independent claim involved in the appeal and for each dependent claim argued separately, every means plus function and step plus function under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, and/or (2) set forth the structure, material, or acts described in the specification as corresponding to each claimed function with reference to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawings, if any, by reference characters (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(v)).
5. ☒ The brief does not contain a concise statement of each ground of rejection presented for review (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vi)).
6. ☒ The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each ground of rejection on appeal (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vii)).
7. ☐ The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(viii)).
8. ☐ The brief does not contain copies of the evidence submitted under 37 CFR 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or of any other evidence entered by the examiner and **relied upon by appellant in the appeal**, along with a statement setting forth where in the record that evidence was entered by the examiner, as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(ix)).
9. ☐ The brief does not contain copies of the decisions rendered by a court or the Board in the proceeding identified in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of the brief as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(x)).
10. ☒ Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):

The status of claims 4, 7, 8, and 10-17 is unclear from the record. These claims were withdrawn from consideration with traverse. A complete reply to the final rejection should have included the cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01. However, no such action was taken. The status of the claims indicates that claims 4, 7, 8, and 10-17 are withdrawn from consideration. The appendix appears to indicate that the claims were cancelled; however, appellant has never cancelled these claims. Appropriate action must be taken. The grounds of rejection was misplaced in section 3 rather than section 6. The argument section appears to contain separate arguments for separate claims; however, appellant has failed to place these arguments under separate headings.

Eric Keasel 11 OCT 2005

Eric Keasel
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 3754